

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 RAM BHAROSE,

11 Petitioner,

No. MISC S-04-0305 WBS JFM PS

12 vs.

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
14 et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed the above-entitled action. The matter was
17 referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 72-302(c)(21).

18 On August 26, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations
19 herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any
20 objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. Plaintiff has
21 filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

22 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-
23 304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire
24 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by
25 proper analysis.


26 /////

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed August 26, 2005, are adopted in full;

2. Respondent's July 5, 2005 motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction be granted and this action be, and the same hereby is, dismissed.

DATED: September 22, 2005



WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

/bharose.805